

Samph.
Relig.
Theol.
J.



3 1761 09621513 2



JESUIT MAXIMS

DOES THE END JUSTIFY THE MEANS?

(No. 1.)

Does the End Justify the Means?

(*American Quarterly Review*, January 1888.)

Compendium Theologiæ Moralis, a Joanne Petro Gury, S. J., primo Exaratum, nunc vero ad Breviorem Formam Redactum. Ab ALOYSIO SABETTI, S.J. Ed. Tertia. Neo-Eboraci: Pustet. 1887.

Compendium Theol. Moralis S. Alphonsi M. de Ligorio. Sive Medulla Theol. Moralis HERMANNI BUSENBAUM, S.J., ab ipso Ligorio Adjectis Nonnullis Animadversionibus Probata. Ed. Altera Emendatior, Priori omnino Conformis. Iriæ: (1) Typis Cæsaris Giani. 1840. Two vols. 8vo.

Theologia Moralis in V. Libros Partita. Auctore PAULO LAYMANN, Soc. Jesu Theologo. Venetiis: Typis Antonii Tivani. 1691. Two vols. Folio.

Encyclopædia Britannica (American Reprint). Philadelphia: J. M. Stoddart & Co. 1881. Vol. xiii., *art.* JESUITS.

In our last number we spoke of the popularity of F. Sabetti's abridgment of Gury's "Moral Theology" as evinced by the demand for a second edition, the first having been soon exhausted. Since then it has gained rather than lost in favor, and we are glad to see how well its merits are appreciated by professors and students. Every copy of the second edition was sold within six weeks from the date of publication, and a third has been prepared by the publishers, Pustet & Co.

Yet, in looking over these repeated editions one thing, and one only, has disturbed our equanimity. *Mihi unus scrupulus etiam restat*, as the comic poet says, *qui me male habet*. We have looked, and looked in vain, throughout F. Sabetti's volume for some trace of that "recognized maxim of the Society," as Dr. Littledale calls it: "The end justifies the means," How cruel of the good Father to take away from under Catholic heads that comfortable cushion, by the help of which, from the days of St. Ignatius to the present, his children have taught us to still any unpleasant murmur of conscience, and sin as we list, provided we decently veil it with a pious intention! What a pity that by his silence he has taken away from the Littledales, Coxes,

(1) Voghera in Upper Italy.

and other Protestant divines, their rivals in zeal and honesty, all chance of quoting and denouncing him in company of the Busenbaums, Laymanns, Wagemanns, and other "leading Jesuit theologians" who "lay down the maxim" !

But, seriously speaking, is such a maxim to be found in the works of Jesuit moralists? And if so, who first wrote it, and when and where? The latest writer to make the assertion on this side of the water is Bishop Coxe of Buffalo, who, though he cannot boast of profound scholarship or extensive reading, is a pleasing, versatile writer, and one who can pride himself on the protean facility which enables him to assume at will every shape and form of religious metamorphosis, Catholic, Protestant, High-Church, Low-Church, as may suit his purpose. The only thing in which he is consistent is his fierce, unscrupulous hatred of Rome, the Catholic Church and the Jesuits. We heard him give vent to it very lately in Washington, where he sat among the members of the Evangelical Alliance—a "Catholic" Bishop and successor of the Apostles (to take his own word for it) consorting with ministers whom he regards as laymen, and some of them religionists of very doubtful orthodoxy. No one would suspect him of such recondite erudition as to discover, what his betters have failed to do, where the impious maxim lies stowed away in the thousand and one folios written on moral theology by Jesuit divines. No doubt he had, in addition to the fables of the nursery and Sunday-school, read something of the sort in the infamous diatribes of the French atheist, Paul Bert, circulated with loving zeal in England and America by pious ministers and their religious newspapers; and further, in the writings of Rev. Dr. Littledale, with which he shows himself very familiar. But neither of these men stands so high in the critical world that his mere assertion will compel assent. Hence, when the "Anglo-Catholic" Bishop, in the course of his petty, dishonest warfare with the Catholic Church, thought fit to accuse the Jesuits of teaching that "the end justifies the means", he merely asserted it, adding nothing to prove his allegation. This was about a year ago. The foul charge was immediately denied by the Jesuit Faculty of Canisius College, Buffalo. To their indignant denial they added an offer of one thousand dollars to Bishop Coxe or any one else who could sustain the slanderous accusation by a single reference to the page of even one Jesuit writer.

To maintain his credit Bishop Coxe had to make some show of offering proof. The atheistical witness could not decently be summoned. He had not only vanished, but as witness he was doubly dead; or rather, his testimony had expired only to rise again as testimony on the other side. Paul Bert had departed this life, a victim of the deadly fevers of Eastern Asia, whither he had gone to represent the interest of the French Republic in its commerce and conquests. His death was no misfortune, as his friends in France regarded it. It was a stroke of God's grace; a blessing without stint or measure, and (humanly speaking) as undeserved as it was unexpected. Had he died at home, his last sighs for God's forgiveness would have been stifled by the importunate clamors of his infidel friends; his attempts at reconciliation with the Church would have been baffled by the

vigilance of those foul fiends in human shape who, with blasphemous derision, style themselves Angel Guardians, and whose office it is to see that those over whom they watch die in their sins and unbelief. Thus died Voltaire, Victor Hugo, the poet Leopardi, and a host of others; and the loss of their souls was hailed with the plaudits of infidels, re-echoed by pious Protestants throughout the world. But it was in the wilds of Tonquin that God, in His infinite mercy, summoned Paul Bert first to repentance and then to judgment. He renounced his impiety and was reconciled to the Church. So notorious had been Bert's hostility to Revelation and the Catholic Church, which he logically identified with Christianity, that the news of his conversion startled all Europe. Infidels boldly denied it, and good Christians were afraid to believe it on higher ground than the poet's

Periculosum est credere et non credere.

But at last a letter from the French prelate under whose jurisdiction and ministry Paul Bert had died, dispelled all doubts. (1). Since, as all men know, no sinner can be reconciled to the Church without detesting and retracting all sins of impiety, calumny, and the like, it was plain enough that Paul Bert had ceased to be a witness on the infidel and Protestant side; and common prudence dictated that his testimony should be carefully suppressed, lest it should suggest to incautious Christian-minded Protestants that a man is more likely to tell the truth when he has before his face the solemn hour of death and the terrors of eternity.

Bishop Coxe, therefore, had to discard his recollections of Paul Bert and fall back on his other authority, Rev. Dr. Littledale. Consequently he brings him forward, or rather his article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," as a witness, furnishing "textual quotations from three Jesuit writers, fully meeting the challenge." This much we learn from a recent letter of Bishop Coxe, addressed to the New York *Churchman*, and republished in the New York *Herald* of January 9th, 1888. It is said that the bishop's statements were refuted by F. Coleridge in the London *Month*, and by F. Jones in a book entitled "Dishonest Criticism," but we have been unable to lay our hand on either work, or on the bishop's original letter of a year ago. We, therefore, thrust him aside and turn our attention to his principal.

Dr. Littledale's allegation may be found in an article written by him for the "Encyclopædia Britannica" under the heading JESUITS, (2) in which he gives as "the result of dispassionate examination" that "the three principles of probabilism, of mental reservation, and of

(1) We are aware that, recently, some have revived these doubts, and hence, though seeing no reason to call in question the prelate's assertion, we are content to abstain from pressing the point, or give it up altogether. If Paul Bert died in his sins, making no sign, no effort to repair the wrong he did, so much the worse for him. The Littledales, the Coxes, and the Presbyterian papers that gloried, some months ago, in his abuse of Jesuit and Catholic morality, are welcome to their godless friend and witness.

(2) Vol. xiii., p. 661.

justification of means by ends, which collectively make up what educated men intend by the term "Jesuitry," are recognized maxims of the Society. As the last of these three is at once the most odious in itself and the charge which is most anxiously repelled, it is well to cite three leading Jesuit theologians in proof. Busenbaum, whose "Medulla Theologiæ" has been more than fifty times printed, and lately by the Propaganda itself, lays down the maxim in the following terms: "Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita," and "Cui licitus est finis, etiam licent media;" Laymann, similarly, in his "Theologia Moralis," "Cui concessus est finis, concessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinata;" and Wagemann in his "Synopsis Theol. Moralis," yet more tersely, "Finis determinat probitatem actus."

We begin with Busenbaum. One would think that in a learned article written for an Encyclopædia, especially where charges of the grossest immoral teaching are brought forward against a body or school whose theologians are almost innumerable, no thoughtful or honest man would consider he had discharged his duty by merely huddling together a few disjointed scraps of Latin. It is a *prima facie* evidence of intent to impose on his readers. Dr. Littledale could, had he wished, have quoted more accurately, and given us chapter and verse of his original; in other words, some clew to the context, instead of the miserable attempt at "textual quotations" of which Bishop Coxe is not ashamed to boast, as if quoting a bare text furnished also its context. The first passage is taken from the "Medulla," Book IV., Chap. III., Dub. III., Article II., § 3. Why was no indication of this set before the reader? The answer is very clear. It would have defeated Dr. L.'s purpose, which was to slander Busenbaum and prevent the public from finding it out. It is not pleasant to have to attribute evil motives to the reverend writer. But the stern necessity of law and logic will not allow us to deal otherwise with this habitual offender against the eighth commandment.

In the passage we have quoted Busenbaum is not laying down the fundamental principles of morality. These are treated by most theologians in a preliminary treatise, "De Actibus Humanis," which is not found in Busenbaum's work. (1) He is only examining a special moral question, viz: Is it allowable for a prisoner condemned to death to escape from jail and thus save his life? The answer is in the affirmative, and the reason is added. Since by the natural law a man has a right to his life, he may pursue and secure that right, provided he do not infringe the rights of another. Hence he may break his chains, scale the prison-wall, or in any other way elude the vigilance of his keepers, because these means become legitimate when the end to be attained is legitimate. "*Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita.*" (2) This is not laying down any universal moral law but an application of the law to a moral case, which may furnish matter for doubt. In fact, the section is called by this very name of DOUBT,

(1) Hence in the edition of Voghera a brief summary of such treatise was added from the "Homo Apostolicus" of St. Alphonsus Liguori.

(2) Ed. Iriæ, p. 269.

"Dubium VII. de Reo," and Article II. has the caption, "*Quid liceat reo circa fugam pœnæ*—How far may a guilty man go in the matter of escaping punishment?" In his answer Busenbaum evidently supposes "means" innocent in themselves, not bad, sinful means that will become *good* because of the end proposed. For he distinctly lays down that in these means there must be no injustice, no invasion of the rights of others. Hence the escape must be effected without violence or wrong done to any one else (*præcisa vi et injuria*).⁽¹⁾ But why should he take pains to maintain that in this particular case the lawful end renders the means lawful? Because here there is an apparent conflict of laws, natural law allowing what human law forbids; and it becomes necessary to decide which has the higher claim. Busenbaum decides in favor of the natural law. He may be right or wrong in his decision; but he lays down no immoral principle. If he is wrong, the wrong consists, not in any improper teaching, but in having mistaken the correct solution of the question.

But was he mistaken? He was not. All moral theologians, all who treat of natural ethics, give the same answer. Out of the thousands that might be quoted we give only two, Archbishop Kenrick in his "Moral Theology,"⁽²⁾ and Bishop Jeremy Taylor,⁽³⁾ a Protestant of the same sect ("branch" they would have us call it) as Drs. Coxe and Littledale. We can now understand why Dr. L. so carefully suppressed all reference to the place of his "textual quotation." He trusted that his readers would take his mere word for any anti-Catholic statement he might make, and he has rewarded them, as they deserved, by abusing their confidence and deceiving them. Bishop Coxe, we take for granted, never saw the passage in the original, and erred, like the rest of that credulous crowd, in pinning his faith to the sleeve of his Anglican fellow-worker against the Church and the Jesuits. But the error is a serious one. "A teacher in Israel," as he claims to be, ought to have a little more discretion, and, it is no harm to add, a little more conscience. It might be well for him to take a lesson out of the moral theology taught by those wicked Jesuits, and endorsed by the Church. They say that it is a grievous sin not only to slander another, but also deliberately to expose oneself to the danger of slandering him by recklessly, and without due inquiry, accusing him of teaching what is blasphemous and subversive of the Ten Commandments. And the slander acquires a tenfold intensity when such wickedness is attributed not to one individual but to thousands of men, consecrated to God, and in whose holy lives a hostile world, and the very slanderer himself, confesses that he can find no matter of reproach.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Ibid.

(2) "Theol. Moralis," ed. of Malines, Vol. I., p. 260.

(3) In his "Ductor Dubitantium," Lib. iii., ch. 2, apud Kenrick, loc. cit.

(4) Dr. Littledale himself confesses that, while many of the secular and even parochial clergy did not live up to their holy state of life, "the Jesuits won back respect for the clerical calling by their personal culture and the unimpeachable purity of their lives. These are qualities which they have all along carefully maintained, and probably no body of men in the world has been so free from the reproach

Now, is Dr. Littledale a safe guide, an authority that an honest man could blindly follow? Eighteen or twenty years ago he would not have written as he writes now. He was then standing almost on the threshold of the Catholic Church and devising plans (it was said) for opening the doors of intercommunion between her and the Anglican clergy. These plans failed, whether by the framer's bungling or by opposition from within or without, we are unable to say. But from that day Dr. L. was a changed man; and there are not wanting, even in his own "branch" some who attribute the change to mortified vanity. It has driven him back to be once more, what he was originally, an Irish Orangeman. Not that he believes in "the glorious and immortal memory" of pious King William, or would swear to "wade knee deep in Papists' blood"; but that he entertains once more for the Catholic Church that fierce, relentless hatred of which Orangemen are the worst type. He continues to be, however, a leader among the Ritualists, abhors the very name of Protestant and denounces the great "Reformers," as a pack of the most unmitigated rascals that were ever seen in the world. Yet, without having first made his peace with the "Reformers," he knows how to pander adroitly to the prejudices, and work himself into the favor, of their children. He has written lately a book (1) to dissuade Ritualists from seeking salvation in the One, True, Catholic Church. For wicked slander and venomous misrepresentation of all that Catholics look upon as true and holy, the book might have been written by an apostate priest such as William Hogan, by the Hoyts and other clerical friends of Maria Monk, or (barring the decency of style) by that unmitigated rascal (as Dr. L. loves to call him), Martin Luther himself.

The book contains about two hundred pages, and keen critics have proved that there are in it just that number of glaring mistakes, one to every page. And these mistakes are not of the kind that may be excused as having their origin in ignorance or negligence. They are deliberate misstatements, ranging from the *suppressio veri* to downright mendacity. But the most frequent of them all is habitual MISQUOTATION, giving words "textually," and deliberately suppressing the context, because it would furnish their true meaning. He himself has confessed the truth of these charges by making alterations in the second and third editions of his "Plain Reasons." But who could alter the spirit of his book? The changes he has introduced are made in a grudging, half-hearted way, that shows them to have been extorted by shame and fear, not by candor and love of the truth. In a passage

of discreditable members, or has kept up an equally high average level of intelligence and conduct." (ART. JESUITS, p. 658.) On the next page (660) he admits that one of the most serious blows that damaged their credit, viz., the publication of the "Monita Secreta," was a "forgery." Yet, with all this, he goes on so to explain, patronize, caress and fondle this idle story, that he shows evidently his regret that it was a forgery, and would prefer that people should believe it to be true.

(1) "Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome."

vituperative of Catholic theologians, he has painted himself and his controversial habits in such accurate colors, that we must transcribe it :

"Things have come to this pass, that no statement whatever, however precise and circumstantial, no reference to authorities, however seemingly frank and clear.....can be taken on trust, without a rigorous search and verification. The thing may be true, but there is not so much as a presumption of its proving so when tested. The degree of guilt varies, no doubt, from deliberate and conscious falsehood with fraudulent intent, down through reckless disregard as to whether the thing be true or false, to mere overpowering bias causing misrepresentation ; but truth, pure and simple, is almost never to be found, and the whole truth in no case whatever."

A capital picture, drawn from the inmost depths of self-consciousness ! And is this the man, even though he speak through the pages of an encyclopædia, who is to be admitted as a witness against the Catholic Church and her religious orders ?

The second quotation from Busenbaum we have been unable to find, after an accurate search through his "Medulla." We feel almost certain that it is not to be found there at all. It is the former passage, substantial in the sense, but slightly varied in the form of words. Dr. Littledale seems to have picked it up at second hand from some of the many German pamphleteers who, during the late Kulturkampf, attacked the Jesuits and their teaching, and quoted the words from memory.

The third quotation from Laymann has been already virtually disposed of in what was said of Busenbaum. He, too, is treating of the question, whether a man condemned to death can lawfully escape by flight. He answers, yes ; and quotes many theologians of great name in his favor, among them St. Thomas, Cajetan, Toletus. etc. "And to effect this (he adds), he may burst his bonds and break through the jail enclosure (*vincula et carceres perfringere*). For to one to whom the end is allowable, to him also the means necessary for that end are allowable. *Cui enim concessus est finis, huic etiam media ad finem necessaria concessa sunt.*" (1) Dr. Littledale's form of words does not exactly agree with the original. Are we to suppose that he has taken this quotation, too, at second hand, and from some German Protestant or infidel source ? The fact that none but German Jesuits (Busenbaum, Laymann and Wagemann) are brought into play, would lend some color to the supposition. But our quarrel is not the mere change in form of the quotation. Why was the word *necessaria* changed into *ordinata* ? NECESSARY means for a good end, must always be good ; but bad means may be *suited* or adapted for that end. To propagate God's kingdom on earth, preaching and teaching are necessary and good means ; to hate and persecute those who will not come in, or drag them in forcibly, may be *suited* to the accomplishment of that end, but does not make them good means or lawful. We fear that this change was not honest. *Latet anguis in herba.*

(1) Layman, Theol. Mor. Lib. i. Tract vi. cap. xv. p. 64 of the Venice edition, 1691.

The last quotation is from Wagemann's (1) "Synopsis." We are unable to verify it, not having any copy of the book. To say that "the end determines the goodness of an action" is susceptible of a very good and true meaning. But it may also carry with it a bad and false meaning. Hence we have no hesitation in saying that the quotation has not been correctly given, and that its "terseness" consists in the excision of some words necessary to make it complete and unexceptionable. Dr. Littledale's notorious dishonesty in the matter of quotation forbids our taking his word on trust without accurate search and verification. It is not the practice of our theologians to be loose or inaccurate in laying down principles in a text-book. It is not only the goodness, but also the wickedness of an action that flows from the end proposed; and none of our theologians has ever failed to state this distinctly, especially in the treatise "*De Actibus Humanis*," where the sources and fundamental principles of morality are laid down and vindicated. We gather at random a few examples.

Kenrick says: "*Ex fine actus bonitas vel malitia etiam derivatur.*" (2) "From the end of an action flows its goodness, and likewise its wickedness." F. Sabetti: "*Actus humanus veram moralitatem* (3) *a fine desumit.*" "Man's deliberate action takes its real moral character from the end." These, too, are the identical words of Gury. (4) F. Clement Marc (5) says: "*Finis operantis tribuit veram moralitatem actui humano.*" "It is the end proposed by the agent that gives its true moral character to his deliberate action." And that very Laymann (6) who is triumphantly quoted by the Littledales, Coxes and other pious controversialists of their stamp, as a chief exponent of wicked Jesuit morality, says: "I maintain that this end (the end proposed by the agent) gives to an action a new specific character of goodness or wickedness." If Busenbaum had written a treatise "*De Actibus Humanis*," he would have said the same thing, for it is the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

But does any Jesuit expressly lay down the doctrine that good ends will NOT sanctify bad means? Yes; all of them, without exception. Laymann says: "Sixthly, the adjunct of a good end does not help an action that is bad in itself, but lets it remain in its simple and thorough wickedness (*relinquit simpliciter et undequaque malum*)." (7) Gury says clearly: "*Omnis electio medii mali est mala.*" (8) "Every choice

(1) This author died in 1792. His book was published about 1765. See Hurter in "*Nomenclator*."

(2) *Theol. Mor.*, vol. v., p. 16. *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

(3) *Moralitas* is not our English "morality." In theological works it has a technical sense, and means "moral relation or character," whether good or bad.

(4) *Compend. Theol. Mor.*, Romæ, 1874, vol. i., p. 26.

(5) *Institutiones morales Alphonsianæ*. Romæ. 1835. Vol. i., p. 193.

(6) *Op. cit.*, Lib. i., *Tract. ii.*, cap. ix., p. 23.

(7) *Ibid.* "*Sexto casu*," etc.

(8) *Ibid.* p. 27.

of evil means is wicked (even where the end is good)." But what is the use of multiplying quotations? Let one Jesuit be produced who has written a treatise "*De Actibus Humanis*," and has either deliberately suppressed or even innocently forgot to put down this teaching, and we will surrender our entire case.

These falsehoods about Jesuit teaching are not new, nor are they confined to the English-speaking countries of Protestantism. The bigot, whose anti-Catholic zeal urges him to misrepresentation and slander, is to be found everywhere. In Germany, the birthplace of the "Reformation," they have never been wanting. From the day when the patient labor of the Jesuits, under Faber, Canisius and their disciples, first checked the spread of the new heresy, purged southern Germany of its leaven, and drove it back to its northern home, anti-Jesuit calumny became the fashion, and lasted for hundreds of years, until about a century ago, when the Lutheran clergy became skeptics and infidels, and cared as little for Luther as they did for the successor of St. Peter. After this lull, a revival of the no-Popery cry has revisited Germany, and the old, stale calumnies are republished as boldly as if they were new discoveries, and had not been a thousand times triumphantly refuted. What gave the first impulse was the partial freedom gained by the Church after the events of 1848, which aroused the anger of those who had long enjoyed the pleasure of seeing her placed under the yoke of State supervision, and who seemed to regard it as their own loss that she should emerge from the chains of bureaucratic tyranny.

To revenge their disappointment, the usual contrivance of attacking the Church through the Jesuits was resorted to. Their immoral principles, and, above all, the maxim, "The end justifies the means," were made the subject of unnumbered books and pamphlets. Of the bad faith and wicked motives of these writers there can be no question. It is enough to say that amongst the impugnors of Jesuit morality we find the name of that holy (!) man, the notorious Joannes Ronge, the "second Luther," as his flatterers loved to call him.⁽¹⁾ These calumnies, however, were not allowed to go uncontradicted. Father Roh, a preacher of some eminence, at the close of a successful mission in Frankfort (1852), which Lutherans and infidels had tried to impair by disseminating in print the wicked maxim attributed to the Order, read from the pulpit a declaration, to which he begged his hearers, Catholic and Protestant, to give the widest circulation. The substance of it was this: If any witness could produce a Jesuit author who had uttered the maxim, "The end justifies the means," literally or in equivalent terms, he would pay him a thousand florins (Rhenish currency). The decision was to rest with the Protestant faculty of the University of Heidelberg, or with the mixed faculty (Protestant and Catholic) of Bonn. This offer he repeated in the Protestant cities of Halle, in 1862, and Bremen, in 1863. Ten years and more had passed, and no one had accepted the challenge. At last a theologian, Maurer by name,

(1) He died a few weeks ago in obscurity, despised or forgotten, unrepentant and unshriven, as generally happens to apostate priests.

took it up and published a pamphlet in which he claimed that he had proved his point and was entitled to the reward. All he could allege was the passage of Busenbaum already discussed (about a condemned prisoner's right to escape): "Cum finis est licitus, etc." Of course, he furnished no context, to explain how or why Busenbaum had used such language. The faculty of Heidelberg would not allow his claim. Nor will it ever be allowed by any honest Protestant. One of them, Büchmann, calls the maxim a perversion or distortion of propositions found in Jesuit moralists. (1) The same is said by another, Wander, in his "Lexicon of Proverbs." (2). And a third, Hertslet, (3) positively affirms that the Jesuits never held or taught such a maxim, and attributes the hold it has on the popular mind to knavish romancers like Eugene Sue.

It is a proud distinction for the Jesuits that their enemies can find no valid weapons against them, and are compelled to resort to falsehood and slander. They are in this point faithful representatives of the Church of Christ at this day, as she is of the primitive Church of the Apostles. Are our Protestant friends aware that they are repeating against us the identical slanders that were hurled at the Church in the days of St. Paul? Then, too, wicked Jews and lying Pagans charged her with holding the blasphemous maxim, that evil may be done for a good purpose. (Rom. iii. 8.)

[Rt. Rev. JAMES A. CORCORAN, D.D.]

(1) Geflügelte Worte, Berlin, 1882. "Eine Einstellung Jesuitischer Sätze." This popular book has reached a thirteenth edition. Quoted in "Geschichtslügen," Paderborn, 1885, p. 532, a valuable little book, which we hope to see translated some day into English.

(2) Leipzig, 1880, quoted, *ibid.*

(3) *Ibid.*

APPENDIX.

(From the *Brooklyn Catholic Review*.)

I

January 21, 1888.

Mr. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Western New York, has ignominiously rejected a very open offer to win a thousand dollars from the Jesuits whom he accused of teaching the principle that the end justifies the means. It is a long standing offer made by Canisius College, but the bishop has wholly failed to come up to time. He was asked to prove his charge, and he gave as his authority an encyclopædia ! Probably the bishop takes most of his theology and knowledge from encyclopædias.

Oh! Bishop Coxe, Bishop Coxe!
You're in the wrong box,
And you're not orthodox.

The bishop made a spectacle of himself, as a Latin scholar, besides. He gave as proof that the Jesuits maintain that the end justifies the means, the maxim, *Finis determinat probitatem actus*. "This met the bravado effectually," he says, of those who challenged him to produce from any Jesuit authority the passage justifying his accusation. Really, Bishop, if we were a teacher, and a twelve year-old boy were to present that Latin sentence as in any sense upholding that the end justifies the means, we'd whale him. Literally it reads, The end determines the probity of an action. It judges actions by their motives, and holds that a person must be judged morally by his intention. For instance, a pedestrian turns a street corner hastily and comes into collision with a woman, who falls down, sustains a fracture of the head and dies. Now, in fact, the man has killed the woman, but he did not mean to do so. He had no *finis*, no object in view in striking against her. He is therefore, not morally guilty of murder. But, in another case, the same man having a grudge against another woman, waits for an opportunity to harm her, lurks around a corner near her dwelling, and, when he sees her, rushes against her, as if by accident, but really by design, knocks her down and causes her to sustain injuries that result in death. *Finis determinat probitatem actus*. His purpose settles his innocence or guilt and his purpose was homicidal, so his action was murder. So the probity of the same sort of action, with the same sort of effect, is fixed by the motive, and in one case it was an accident and in the other a crime. This is as far from the theory that the end justifies the means as Bishop Coxe is from being a controversialist on whom his friends can depend for a victory in any dispute in which sound erudition and common sense are involved.

February 4, 1888.

The following letter appeared in the *Indianapolis Journal*, January 12 :

BISHOP COXE AND THE JESUITS.

To the Editor of the Indianapolis Journal :

Some time ago you published a reflection on Bishop COXE, of Western New York. As I am a reader of your paper, and thinking that you will publish the other side, I now give you the opportunity. The letter was addressed to the *Churchman*, a Church periodical of New York city.

" To the Editor of the Churchman :

" A little more than a year since I had occasion to quote the Jesuit maxim, ' The end justifies the means.' To answer it, one of the Jesuit Fathers inserted the following bravado in one of our local journals of largest circulation :

" ' If Bishop COXE can show from the authentic works of the thousand writers of the Society of JESUS that the Jesuits teach the principle that the end justifies the means, he shall receive the reward of \$1,000, payable at CANISIUS College, this city.' "

" This was immediately answered by the Bishop declining the reward, unless they were willing to send it to one of our benevolent institutions, but referring him for proof to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. VIII., p. 651, where are to be found textual quotations from the Jesuit writers (BUSENBAUM, LAYMAN and WAGEMANN), fully meeting the challenge. The article quotes from one of them as follows : *Finis determinat probitatem actus.*" This met the bravado effectually, but, needless to say, the reward was not paid. The Jesuits contented themselves with replying that this maxim does not mean that ' the end justifies bad means.' (Answer: Good means require no justification). I have accepted their challenge and given a responsible reference to which everybody has access. It would be easy to give other data, but who can bind PROTEUS? Enough ! It illustrates their maxim that they now circulate through the newspapers statements that ' the Bishop had never met their challenge.' I write this only to gratify friends who have inquired of me as to the facts.

" A. CLEVELAND COXE,
" Bishop of Western New York. "

Had the matter caused no comment I should not have called your attention to the facts in the matter and asked for the publication of the above.

F. W. HENRY.
Rector of Grace Church, Muncie, Ind.

In reply to the above Rt. Rev. Bishop CHATARD, writing to the *Journal* under date of January 13th, says :

"Your issue of January 12 contains a communication signed by 'F. W. HENRY, Rector of Grace Church, Muncie,' in which is contained a very extraordinary letter written by Right Rev. A. CLEVELAND COXE, Bishop of Western New York. Were it not that this letter is vouched for by Rev. Mr. HENRY, and that I know something of Bishop COXE, I should have hesitated to look upon such a document as coming from one of his standing. Some thirty-three years ago he was Rector of Grace Church, Baltimore, and gratified his feeling of hostility to the Catholic Church by a violent attack on the recently-defined doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which taught that the Mother of CHRIST never was stained by original sin as all the rest of the human race are. From that time to this he has seemingly let pass no opportunity of aspersing the Catholic Church, his *bête noire*. This letter is certainly extraordinary. That an Anglican Bishop should go to the Encyclopædia Britannica for his theology is, I am under the impression, unusual. The source of information, we must charitably presume, must be the Bishop's excuse, if possible, for the very serious statements and insinuations his letter contains; statements unfounded, to use a mild term, and insinuations that it would be difficult to palliate. Bishop COXE accuses the Jesuits of teaching that "the end justifies the means," and refers to the Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. VIII., p. 651, where are to be found citations from Jesuits, and he ends by quoting from one of them: "*Finis determinat probitatem actus.*" He does not translate: he has been charging that the Jesuit maxim is, "The end justifies the means." With all due respect, I would call the attention of the Bishop to the fact that this is not the translation of the Latin phrase. Its real translation is, "The end determines the goodness of an act" —the purpose one has makes an act good or bad. If a thing is bad in itself, to do it is to have a bad intent, and this intent makes the act a morally bad one. If a thing is not good or bad of its nature, to do it with a bad intent makes the act a morally bad one. If the Bishop, instead of going to the encyclopædia, had gone to the source whence the extract was cited he would have found the following to enlighten his mind, were it possible to pierce his panoply of prejudice. I quote from the Jesuit author, 'J. P. GURY, annotated by ANTONIO BALLERINI, S. J.' In the tract on Human Acts, he says, Sec. 29, 'Any choice of an evil means is a bad act; but not every choice of a good means is a good act,' because the purpose or end might not be good, for the end determines the goodness of the act. 'Whoever uses a bad means for a good purpose is guilty of the wickedness that is in that bad means.' These are the maxims of the Jesuits, and any other imputation is without foundation.

SILAS FRANCIS CHATARD. "

III

March 10, 1888.

(From the Independent.)

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:—Yesterday your note of February 12th, inclosing the open letter, published in the *Independent* of February 9th,

to which I reply, was received. I must thank you for the courteous manner in which it was sent. If in answering, there should be any appearance of want of regard, I disclaim it; but, imitating you in freedom of expression, I shall speak plainly and to the point. And, in the first place, I must decline accepting your condolence on the loss of my opportunity to raise the Catholic people to a high grade in your estimation, by rebelling against the teachings of the Vatican Council. Were you not aware at the time you were making your distinction between Gallicanism and Ultramontanism, that, since the Vatican Council, such a distinction is impossible, this Council having definitely rejected and condemned Gallicanism? If you were not, then you show yourself not a trustworthy writer; for it is our duty to know of what we write. If you were, your distinction I leave you to qualify. Perhaps you confounded Gallican liberties with Gallican teachings. If so, I may tell you they are two very different things: Gallican teachings affected the primacy of jurisdiction and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff; "Gallican liberties" regarded the privileges of the French Church, exceptionally granted. These "liberties" have no place here, and the duties of all are so clearly laid down in the Council of the Vatican, that, like obsolete things, these "liberties" have had their day, and belong to the past. Your proposed articles on "Gallican liberties," therefore, while perhaps doing credit to your learning, would very probably be regarded only in the light of ecclesiastical *bric-à-brac*.

I regret that you should have allowed yourself to speak so disparagingly, not to say contemptuously, of the Catholic people of the United States, you especially, an Anglican Bishop, a Bishop of that Church which for three hundred years and more has had its foot on the neck of Ireland, and studiously impoverished its inhabitants of the Catholic faith, and deprived them of education. Delicacy, not to say a sense of justice, should have checked your pen. The part the Irish Catholic has played in the history of the country is a noble one; and many an Irish and Irish-American soldier has received from all classes the tribute of their admiration for his manly bravery on the field of battle.

You permit yourself to go further than this. You make an attempt, which savors of the Know-Nothing days of your residence in Baltimore, to excite hostility against the Catholic Church. You presume to call American Catholics "a foreign colony." You attempt to excite the feeling of the ignorant and prejudiced against them. You strive to put them before the public as disloyal to the Constitution, and have the courage to bring forward a resolution passed by a tumultuary meeting in New York, to support your assertion that Catholics are "in bondage to a foreign potentate." Truly, my dear Right Reverend Sir, your residence in Buffalo must have made you fall a little behind the times. Are you not aware that the audience to which you refer was a very mixed one? Did you not know that beyond the insignificant number that have shown contumacy, the Catholics of New York are giving a grand example of how freemen submit to the "sweet yoke" of Jesus Christ? All New York knows this: you, it seems, do not.

And then, how could you have the conscience to refer to Catholics

as disloyal, when the records of our wars, the grand work of the Catholic Church through her priests, her chaplains on the battle-field, and her Sisters in the hospitals, is an open book to all? When to such acts, which speak louder than words, we add the bright example of the "hated" Jesuits, who, in Maryland, in concert with Lord Baltimore, founded the first tolerant colony of what is now our country," it is incredible that a gentleman of your position should have wished to have from me an answer to the question, whether the Catholic Church in America will be loyal to the Constitution! The facts are there to answer you. Next to her fidelity to God, all the affection of that Church is for this our country. And while the rest of you look hopelessly around on the surging masses, powerless to control them, with no Church authority to speak in the name and with the truth of God, she alone gives the word of safety, curbs passion, lays down the law of social life, and the masses hear her, for they know she is their best adviser, their mother. You know as well as I do, that the property-holders of America, at this moment, regard the Catholic Church as the bulwark of Society, the only influence capable of resisting the flood of Socialism; and this through the charity she has from God, which loves the poor as well as the rich, while her temples, thank God, are the homes of the poor. Such is this Church against which an Anglican Bishop seeks to stir up the most bitter feeling and even persecution.

To come to my letter in the *Indianapolis Journal* of January 13th, which you style a gratuitous attack on you, I must say, first, it was not gratuitous. For the first time I saw this letter from you, to refute which mine was written, published by a clergyman of Muncie. Its gross charges against the Jesuits were placed under the eye of my people, and before the non-Catholic community. Such falsities I have a right and a duty to dispel. In speaking of that letter you complain that I misrepresent your "sermon" in Baltimore by calling it a violent attack on the Catholic Church. I was only giving my impressions of years ago, for public opinion then gave you the character of the bitter enemy of the Church. As you object, I modify and use the term "vigorous" or "determined" —in short something after the style of your present letter.

Then you say I insinuate a want of theological knowledge on your part by the reference to your quoting from the "Encyclopædia Britannica." Well, really, my dear Right Rev. Sir, without offence, I did not know whether on that particular point you had gone further. It was your best excuse that you had not, and that you had been led to trust to Dr. Littledale; though even that cannot excuse you. Now that I know that you have written so much, and have edited a work on the moral theology of St. Liguori, I am still more puzzled to understand how you could have written what you did. As I said in my previous letter, referred to above, "If the Bishop, instead of going to the 'Encyclopædia,' had gone to the source whence the extract was cited, he would have found the following to enlighten his mind, were it possible to pierce the panoply of his prejudice. I quote from the Jesuit author, J. P. Gury, annotated by Antonio Ballerini. In the treatise on Human Acts, he says, No. 39, "Any choice of an evil means is a

bad act ; but not every choice of a good means is a good act," because the purpose or end might not be good, for the end determines the goodness of the act. "Whoever uses a bad means for a good purpose is guilty of the wickedness which is in that bad means." Note, that this is the principle here taught to be elsewhere and universally applied in each particular case. This, therefore, is the authoritative maxim of the Jesuits, as far removed from your asserted maxim laid to their charge, that "the end justifies the means" as light is from darkness. I leave this before the public who will know how to judge between you and me.

As for your—I must curb myself to call it only cruel and undeserved—tirade on the Jesuits, I can only say that you have delved in the archives of their enemies to find charges against them. Any one who takes what was done against them during the latter part of the eighteenth century, as but little else than a fierce persecution by bad men, shows himself to be a shallow student of history. Even the suppression of the Order by the Pope, forced to it by the clamor of their enemies, proves nothing against them ; for that Papal document does not condemn them of crime, contrary to what you assert.

I will not pursue the subject further. If in defending our theological teaching from attack I have come to the defence of the Jesuits who have been the foremost teachers of that theology, I am glad of it, for though not having had the honor of frequenting their schools, I have learned to respect them greatly as highly educated, pious, exemplary men, an ornament and protection to society. I take for granted you keep away from these Reverend Fathers, and so escape the influence of their words. They are, however, waiting patiently for your answer to their challenge. I refer you, therefore, to them for further discussion on this subject, and to Mgr. Corcoran's article in the last issue of the *Catholic Quarterly*.

One word more in conclusion. You began your letter with a criticism on the press of the country, which you represent "as generally ready to do the Jesuits a service, on political motives." I think you are unduly severe on the newspapers of the country, thus making them organs of the Jesuits. This will be as new to them as to myself. What I see in the press of America is, generally, a love of fair play and sound common sense. To be sure the papers abound with extraordinary and unwarranted matter. But there is a winnowing process always going on among them, and when excitement subsides, they ordinarily reach the truth, and that is what we want. If we make mistakes, they will undoubtedly take a special delight in waking up Homer when he gets sleepy. If just now you have been a little indiscreet in your attack, and they see it and disquiet you, you must bear it with equanimity as I will try to do when my turn comes. With best wishes for your welfare, faithfully yours,

FRANCIS SILAS CHATARD,
Bishop of Vincennes.



